

## REMARKS

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sigona et al. (U.S. 5,694,150), White et al. (U.S. 5,982,351), and the Mastering Windows 3.1 reference. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because none of the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest that different actuations of an input device can yield different menus at the same location as a cursor representing the input device, as featured in the present invention.

With respect to the rejections based upon Sigona and White, Applicant maintains and incorporates by reference herein those arguments previously advanced on pages 5 through 12 of Amendment B, filed November 12, 2002. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider those arguments and withdraw this Section 103 rejection. Additionally, although Applicant does not agree that the Examiner's new proposed combination is proper, or that claims 1-12 read on the proposed combination, Applicant has further amended independent claims 1-2, 4, 7, and 10 in order to expedite prosecution. In light of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the following new arguments and expansions upon the previous arguments.

As previously discussed, and as recognized by the Examiner on page 3 of Paper No. 12, neither Sigona nor White teaches or suggests actuation of the same input device to display a menu, or different menus. Only the Mastering Windows reference has been cited by the Examiner for teaching such a feature as in the present invention. The

Mastering Window reference, however, fails to teach or suggest these features as claimed in the present invention.

The Examiner is correct in his assertion that the Mastering Windows reference shows how different menus may be displayed from consecutive actuations of the same input device. However, this reference also specifically teaches that each of these different menus to be accessed are accessed from a different location on the display screen. In other words, a cursor on the display screen must first move to a new location representing the different menu to be displayed before the actuation of the input device may display the different menu. Nowhere does the Mastering Windows reference that consecutive actuations of the input device while the cursor is positioned at the same display location can yield any of the different menu options discussed. The Mastering Windows reference therefore, fails to teach or suggest the present invention.

In contrast, the independent claims of the present invention have been amended to recite, among other things, that different menus may be selected according to a number of consecutive actuations of the same input device or the duration of actuation time of this device, and at the same location of a cursor displayed on a display screen. In other words, the present invention is capable of realizing different selected menus without changing the location of the displayed cursor. Because the Mastering Windows reference fails to teach or suggest any such features, and for the reasons discussed previously, the § 103 rejection of claims 1-12 of the present invention is respectfully traversed.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this Application, including claims 1-12, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Josh C. Snider", written over a horizontal line.

Josh C. Snider

Registration No. 47,954

**Customer No. 24978**

April 30, 2003

300 South Wacker Drive

Suite 2500

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: (312) 360-0080

Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

K:\0671\63110\Amendment B.doc